

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

These Remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed March 8, 2005 ("Office Action"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-25 for at least the following reasons.

#### **Specification**

The abstract has been amended. More specifically, phrases have been deleted to reduce the number of words. Therefore, the objection to the abstract should be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Objections**

The term "the user" has been replaced with "a user" to overcome the claim objections.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claim 24 has been canceled. Therefore, the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is now moot.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-6, 8-17 and 19-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,057,854 to Davis, Jr. *et al* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,974,181 to Prieto. Claims 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis, Jr. *et al*, Prieto and U.S. Patent No. 6,363,392 to Halstead.

An embodiment of the present invention as originally disclosed is directed to transmitting various types of content data through a defined browser object container where recipients are able to navigate through the content data as provided by the browser object container.

In contrast, Davis, Jr. *et al* comprises a server system and a client system where the server system includes a network accessible file and a vector graphics file comprising an interactive vector object. The vector graphics file is linked to the network accessible file. The

client system includes a network application file to connect to the server to retrieve the network accessible file. The network application file reads the network accessible file and retrieves the linked vector graphics file. A graphics extension then reads the data to render *the image of the vector object*. (col. 1, line 63 to col. 2, line 10).

In essence, Davis, Jr. *et al* discloses a vectorized web page button. Davis, Jr. *et al* is a vectorized version of pre-existing web graphics methods. Davis, Jr. *et al*'s shaping and scaling functionality is specific to a button as an element of an HTML web page. Davis, Jr. *et al* is exclusively concerned with rendering vector images behaving as bit-mapped images to a web page.

The applied combination of Davis, Jr. *et al* and Prieto fails to disclose the claim limitations of claim 1 directed to “identifying content data for inclusion in a *browser object container*,” “defining one or more *navigation options for defining how one or more recipients view the content data as provided by the browser object container*,” “adding the content data with the one or more navigation options to the browser object container *wherein the content data and the one or more navigation options are embedded into a content definition*,” “compressing the content definition into a compressed file,” “encrypting the compressed file into an encrypted file for securing the content data,” and “electronically transmitting the browser object container containing the compressed and encrypted file to the one or more recipients *wherein the one or more recipients navigate through the content data as allowed by the one or more navigation options within the browser object container*.” Claims 12 and 25 recite similar limitations.

For the limitation concerning “*identifying content data for inclusion in a browser object container*,” the Office Action relies upon column 1, lines 45-51 of Davis, Jr. *et al* which

discloses that an interactive vector object can be downloaded over a network. However, this excerpt fails to show a “*browser object container*.” According to the specification on page 6, “[t]he browser object container of an embodiment of the present invention involves a graphical user interface (GUI) development platform which provides a purpose-built Internet browser that may be activated by an Internet Explorer (IE) plug-in.” The disclosure relied upon by the Office Action is directed to a vector object and fails to meet the limitation of a “*browser object container*.”

For the limitation concerning “*defining one or more navigation options for defining how one or more recipients view the content data as provided by the browser object container*,” the Office Action relies upon col. 1, lines 52-62 of Davis, Jr. *et al* which is directed to an active area that may be defined by the type, size and location of the vector object. A command may be performed in response to an event within the active area of the vector object. However, the active area of Davis, Jr. *et al* does not involve “*navigation options for defining how one or more recipient view the content data as provided by the browser object container*.” Rather, Davis, Jr. *et al* is directed to downloading a vector object. The vector object of Davis, Jr. *et al* does not involve any navigation options. In fact, the Office Action has failed to identify any disclosure in Davis, Jr. *et al* that is directed to navigation options for Davis, Jr. *et al*’s vector object. Further, there is no teaching or reasoning that would motivate one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to include navigation options for a vector object. The vector object of Davis, Jr. *et al* relates to an image and does not involve a browser object container where navigation through content data is allowed by navigation options that are embedded in a content definition.

The claims further recite that “*the one or more recipients navigate through the content data as allowed by the one or more navigation options within the browser object container*.” For

this limitation, the Office Action cites to disclosure in Davis, Jr. *et al* that involves an Internet network (column 3, lines 56-57). However, Davis, Jr. *et al* completely fails to show any navigation capabilities for defining how a recipient views the content data as provided by the browser object container. Further, the active area of Davis, Jr. *et al* does not allow one or more recipients to “*navigate through the content data as allowed by the one or more navigation options within the browser object container.*” The vector object of Davis, Jr. *et al* simply does not involve defined navigation options within a browser object container.

For the limitation concerning “adding the content data with the one or more navigation options to the browser object container *wherein the content data and the one or more navigation options are embedded into a content definition;*” the Office Action relies upon column 1, line 66 to column 2, line 10 of Davis, Jr. *et al*. This except also fails to show that Davis, Jr. *et al* discloses the claimed navigation options. In addition, there is no discussion of embedded the content data and the navigation options into a content definition. This limitation is simply missing from the disclosure of Davis, Jr. *et al* and not addressed by the Office Action.

Davis, Jr. *et al* is completely fails to even contemplate a browser object container as claimed by Applicants. Instead, Davis, Jr. *et al* is directed to a web page button. Therefore, there would be no reason or motivation for adding additional steps of compressing and encrypting as claimed by Applicants. The Office Action has failed to show how these claimed limitations would be desirable for the web page button of Davis, Jr. *et al*.

The Office Action admits that Davis, Jr. *et al* fails to show all the claim limitations. More specifically, the Office Action admits that Davis, Jr. *et al* fails to show the limitations directed to “compressing the content definition into a compressed file” and “encrypting the compressed file into an encrypted file for securing the content data.” For these major

deficiencies, the Office Action relies upon Prieto. While Prieto makes mention of vector compression, Prieto emphasizes that prior to vector quantizing (*i.e.*, compressing the data components) the wavelet transformed version of the sampled input signal, the signal *must* be arranged in vector form as depicted in FIG. 3 of Prieto (column 5, lines 8-10, emphasis added). There is no teaching or reason to combine the teaching of vector compression as applied to a signal arranged in vector form of FIG. 3 of Prieto to the disclosure of Davis, Jr. *et al* as Davis, Jr. *et al* does not disclose a signal of the vector form of Prieto. Further, the vector quantization compressor 600 of Prieto adaptively sizes groups of image vectors presented by the wavelet transform and quantizes the image vectors within each group to establish a centroid for each group, and further performs subband compression on input signal subbands. There is no teaching or reason to combine this teaching to the disclosure of Davis, Jr. *et al* that does not suggest any need or reason to integrate a compressor as taught by Prieto for adaptively size groups of image vectors and perform subband compression.

The Office Action has failed to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Specifically, when a primary reference is missing elements, the law of obviousness requires that the Office set forth some motivation why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the primary reference in the exact manner proposed. *Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 234 F.3d 654, 664 (Fed. Cir. 2000). In other words, there must be some recognition that the primary reference has a problem and that the proposed modification will solve that exact problem. All of this motivation must come from the teachings of the prior art to avoid impermissible hindsight looking back at the time of the invention.

In the present case, the Office Action's justification for modifying Davis, Jr. *et al* and Prieto has absolutely nothing to do with the deficiencies of Davis, Jr. *et al*. As admitted by the

Office Action, Davis, Jr. *et al* fails to show at least “compressing the content definition into a compressed file” and “encrypting the compressed file into an encrypted file for securing the content data.” To properly modify Davis, Jr. *et al* to correct for these major deficiencies, the Office Action has the burden to show some motivation why providing those elements would have overcome some perceived problem with Davis, Jr. *et al*. Any such motivation is completely lacking.

Accordingly, the Office Action has failed to provide any proper motivation for modifying Davis, Jr. *et al* as taught by Prieto, so the proposed modification fails. In fact, Davis, Jr. *et al* and Prieto are improperly combined and lack proper motivation. Even if Davis, Jr. *et al* and Prieto could be modified as suggested by the Office Action, the resulting combination would nevertheless fail to show each and every limitation claimed by Applicants.

The mere fact that Davis, Jr. *et al* and Prieto can be somehow combined and modified does not render the resultant modification obvious unless there is a suggestion or motivation found somewhere in the prior art regarding the desirability of the combination or modification. *See* M.P.E.P § 2143.01; *see also In re Mills*, 16 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430, 1432 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *In re Fritz*, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In addition, the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in Applicants’ disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

In addition, the teachings of Halstead fail to make up the deficiencies of Davis, Jr. *et al* and Prieto. For example, Halstead fails to provide any disclosure of a browser object container and navigation options as recited by the claim limitations.

Claims 2-11, 13-23 all depend ultimately from one of independent claims 1 and 12. As such, each of these dependent claims contain each of the features recited in the independent claims. For the reasons stated above, Davis, Jr. *et al* in combination with Prieto fails to disclose the claimed inventions and the rejections should be withdrawn. Similarly, the combination of Davis, Jr. *et al*, Prieto and Halstead also fail to disclose the claimed inventions and the rejections should also be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that prosecution and allowance of the application will be expedited through an interview, whether personal or telephonic, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with any suggestions leading to the favorable disposition of the application.

It is believed that no fees are due for filing this Response. However, the Director is hereby authorized to treat any current or future reply, requiring a petition for an extension of time for its timely submission as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time. Applicants also authorize the Director to charge all required fees, fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.17, or all required extension of time fees, to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Yisun Song  
Registration No 44,487  
for Thomas J. Scott  
Registration No. 27,836

Dated: June 8, 2005

Hunton & Williams LLP  
Intellectual Property Department  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20006-1109  
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)  
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)